

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Gary B. Gordon

Serial No.: 10/734,712

Filed: December 12, 2003

Docket No.: 10031275-1

Title: APPARATUS AND METHOD FOR CONTROLLING A SCREEN POINTERRECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 13 2006

REMARKS

This is responsive to the Non-Final Office Action mailed July 31, 2006. In that Office Action, claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Westerman et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,323,846 ("Westerman").

With this Response, claims 1, 11, and 20 have been amended. Claims 1-20 remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Westerman et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,323,846 ("Westerman").

Amended independent claim 1 recites "the controller configured to generate a second set of movement data when the pointing object is removed from the touch-sensitive surface, thereby leaving the touch-sensitive surface free from contact by a pointing object, the second set of movement data indicative of motion of the pointing object across the touch-sensitive surface prior to removal of the pointing object, **the second set of movement data generated based on predetermined acceleration and deceleration characteristics**".

Amended independent claim 11 recites "generating a second set of motion data based on at least a subset of the first set of motion data after the pointing object is removed from the touch-sensitive surface leaving the touch-sensitive surface free from contact by a pointing object, **the second set of movement data generated based on predetermined acceleration and deceleration characteristics**".

Amended independent claim 20 recites "generating a second set of movement data based on the first set of movement data when a loss of contact occurs between the pointing object and the touch-sensitive surface, the second set of movement data causing **an acceleration of the screen pointer followed by a gradual decrease in a velocity of the screen pointer**."

Westerman does not teach or suggest generating a second set of movement data based on predetermined acceleration and deceleration characteristics, as recited in claims 1 and 11.

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Gary B. Gordon

Serial No.: 10/734,712

Filed: December 12, 2003

Docket No.: 10031275-1

Title: APPARATUS AND METHOD FOR CONTROLLING A SCREEN POINTER

Westerman also does not teach or suggest generating a second set of movement data that causes an acceleration of the screen pointer followed by a gradual decrease in a velocity of the screen pointer, as recited in claim 20. Rather, Westerman discloses that "the cursor or scrolling velocity does not decay during motion continuation mode". (Westerman at col. 53, line 67 to col. 54, line 1). The cursor or scrolling velocity in the motion continuation mode is a constant velocity that corresponds to a previously detected motion. (See, e.g., Westerman at col. 10, lines 57-61).

The Examiner cited Westerman at col. 2, lines 45-47 (Office Action at para. no. 2, page 2), which describes Logan et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,327, 161 ("Logan"). Logan discloses an embodiment that allows an operator to choose a friction setting. (See, e.g., Logan at col. 6, line 33 to col. 7, line 15). However, like the Westerman reference, Logan also does not teach or suggest generating a second set of movement data based on predetermined acceleration and deceleration characteristics, as recited in claims 1 and 11. Westerman also does not teach or suggest generating a second set of movement data that causes an acceleration of the screen pointer followed by a gradual decrease in a velocity of the screen pointer, as recited in claim 20.

In view of the above, independent claims 1, 11, and 20, are not taught or suggested by Westerman. In addition, dependent claims 2-10 and 12-19, which further limit patentably distinct claims 1 and 11, respectively, are also believed to be allowable over the cited reference. Allowance of claims 1-20 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-20 are in form for allowance and are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-20 is respectfully requested.

No fees are required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16(h)(i). However, if such fees are required, the Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3718.

The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's representative at the below-listed telephone numbers to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Gary B. Gordon

Serial No.: 10/734,712

Filed: December 12, 2003

Docket No.: 10031275-1

Title: APPARATUS AND METHOD FOR CONTROLLING A SCREEN POINTER

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to either Jeff A. Holmen at Telephone No. (612) 573-0178, Facsimile No. (612) 573-2005 or Robert W. Nelson at Telephone No. (303) 298-9888, Facsimile No. (303) 297-2266. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

AVAGO TECHNOLOGIES, LTD.

P.O. Box 1920

Denver, Colorado 80201-1920

Respectfully submitted,

Gary B. Gordon,

By his attorneys,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC

Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250

100 South Fifth Street

Minneapolis, MN 55402

Telephone: (612) 573-0178

Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: 9/13/06

JAH:jmc

Jeff A. Holmen

Reg. No. 38,492

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8:

The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper or papers, as described herein, are being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (571) 273-8300 on this 13th day of September, 2006.

By: Jeff A. HolmenName: Jeff A. Holmen